ATTACHMENT C

Finding Of No Significant (FONSI) - Riley Ridge Natural Gas Project, Sour Gas Pipeline Alternatives.

Supplemental Environmental Assessment To The Riley Ridge Natural Gas Project FEIS - Sour Gas Pipeline Alternatives.

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT (FONSI)

RILEY RIDGE NATURAL GAS PROJECT, SOUR GAS PIPELINE ALTERNATIVES

The attached environmental assessment (EA) supplements the Riley Ridge Natural Gas project final environmental impact statement (FEIS). The EA analyzes three slightly different sour gas pipeline routes from the well field to the Craven Creek and the Shute Creek plant sites. The purpose of this EA is to identify any additional impacts which might result from development of these routes which would differ from those analyzed for the proposed action route.

This FONSI serves as the decision on whether or not a supplemental EIS is necessary for the above actions. A record of decision will be prepared on the project that will state the decisions on actions analyzed in the FEIS as well as those analyzed in this EA.

If any of the alternative routes described in this EA are selected, all mitigation measures required or recommended in Chapter 4 of the DEIS and all changes, deletions, and additions as stated in the FEIS, will also be required or recommended.

Based upon the analysis in the attached EA, I find that these additional routes as mitigated would not have a significantly different impact on the human environment than those which were analyzed in the FEIS. Therefore, I conclude that no supplemental EIS is necessary.

P D Leonard — January 25, 1984

State Director, Wyoming — Date

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT TO THE RILEY RIDGE NATURAL GAS PROJECT FEIS SOUR GAS PIPELINE ALTERNATIVES

LOCATED IN

SUBLETTE & LINCOLN COUNTIES
WYOMING

Prepared by
Division of EIS Services
Denver Service Center

JANUARY 1984

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES

INTRODUCTION

The Riley Ridge Project is a natural gas development project which includes the construction, operation, and abandonment of a deep gas well field in western Wyoming; gathering lines for the transportation of sour gas within the well field, gathering lines to the treatment plants; the treatment plants, sales gas pipelines; for delivery of sales gas to existing gas transmission pipelines, and facilities for the handling and transportation of by-products (sulfur and carbon dioxide) to markets. The project represents three individual projects proposed by:

1. Northwest Pipeline Corporation and Mobil Oil Corporation
2. Exxon Company, U.S.A.
3. American Quasar Petroleum Company and Williams Exploration Company

Major project actions and components consist of the following: (1) exploration, development, and abandonment of a 159,928-acre, low-Btu gas well field; (2) construction, operation, maintenance, and abandonment of four sour gas treatment plants with a total processing capacity of 2.8 billion cubic feet per day (cfd) and producing 576 million cfd of methane; (3) construction, operation, maintenance, and abandonment of associated rights-of-way for gathering lines, trunk lines, railroads, access roads, transmission lines, and other ancillary facilities; and (4) processing and transportation of products and by-products.

The applicants have applied to the U.S. Department of the Interior (DOI), Bureau of Land Mangement (BLM) for right-of-way permits to cross federal land managed by the BLM and Forest Service (FS). An enivronmental impact statement (EIS) was prepared jointly by BLM and FS. The BLM assumed the administrative lead and was responsible for filing the EIS with the Environmental Protection Agency.

In addition to the proposed project, numerous component alternatives and siting alternatives were evaluated in the EIS. These included a sulfur transport alternative, power supply alternative, and an employee housing alternative; and the Buckhorn, Shute Creek, and Northern sour gas treatment plant siting alternatives; as well as an No Action Alternative.

The EIS identified possible impacts to the Health and Safety of residents who live near one of the sour gas pipelines, if a rupture were to occur. Comments from the general public also showed a concern to reduce this risk as much as possible.

As a result of these concerns revised mitigation measure H-4, (page 3-9 of the FEIS) states:

> No sour gas trunk line will be located closer than 1 mile to a populated area or sensitive receptor as identified on Map 2-1 in the FEIS. The applicants must use the best available engineering design (i.e., alignment, block valve type and spacing, pipe grade, etc.), best construction techniques (i.e., pipe depth, hydrostatic testing, etc.),

and monitoring plans (i.e., surveillance, warning signs, etc.) as approved by the Authorized Officer to minimize both the probability of rupture and radius of exposure in the event of an accidental pipeline release of sour gas.

A variance from the 1-mile distance may be granted by the Authorized Officer based on detailed site-specific analysis that would consider meteorology, topography, and special pipeline design and/or construction measures. This analysis would ensure that populated areas and sensitive receptors would not be exposed to an increased level of risk.

Three (3) alternative routes, all of which meet this mitigation measure, are being looked at in this EA. See Map-1 for their locations.

All routes will start at the well field and end either at the Craven Creek plant or the Shute Creek plant sites which is the same as the route analyzed in the DEIS and FEIS. The majority of the alternative routes are within the previously analyzed 1-mile-wide corridor and do not vary more than 5 miles from the original route at any point.

This impact analysis is required before a decision can be made on the entire Riley Ridge project and before any right-of-way grants can be issued.

PURPOSE AND NEED

The purpose and need for the Riley Ridge Natural Gas project was identified in the DEIS (pages 1-3). Alternatives in this EA would merely consider and

evaluate different route to serve the purpose and fulfill the need as identified in the DEIS, and to meet the requirements of the revised mitigation measure H-4.

PROPOSED ACTION

General Description

The proposed action of this supplemental EA is the identification and construction of sour gas pipelines from the well field terminus of Exxon and NW to the Craven Creek and Shute Creek plant sites. This was originally described and analyzed under the Shute Creek alternative in the Riley Ridge DEIS and FEIS.

The selection of any alternative described in this EA and shown on Map 1 would not change the construction schedule or any of the methods of construction as described in the DEIS or FEIS.

Alternative 1

The alignment for this alternative would start in the well field terminus, (Big Piney Compressor Station for Northwest Pipeline Company and near Dry Piney Camp for Exxon Company) and progress south and slightly east to a point approximately 1 mile east of Calpet. From there, both pipelines would head south and cross LaBarge Creek and then cross Fontenelle Creek in Section 2, T24N and R113W. After crossing Fontenelle Creek, northwest pipeline would

head southwest to the Craven Creek plant site and Exxon's would head southeast to the Shute Creek site.

Alternative 2

In this alternative, the pipeline would leave the well field the same as described under Alternative 1 but would stay west of Calpet, along the toe of the Hogsback Mountain, until it crossed LaBarge Creek near the narrows in Section 19, T26N and R113W. From just south of LaBarge Creek it would angle east and a little south until it intersects Alternative 1, after which it would be the same as in Alternative 1.

Alternative 3

This alternative would begin the same as Alternative 2 but after crossing LaBarge Creek the pipeline would continue south and east down Holden Hollow where it would intersect with the Alternative 1 route just north of Fontenelle Creek. From there on the route would be the same as in Alternative 1.

CHAPTER 2

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

The following table compares only the impacts that are different from the proposed action as described in the Riley Ridge EIS. All other impacts would be the same or are so minor that they are insignificant.

COMPARISON OF MITIGATED IMPACTS[1]

Item	Proposed Action	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3
HEALTH & SAFETY				
Miles of sour gas trunk line	55	60.5 (+5.5)	62 (+7)	62.5 (+7.5)
Number of trunk line ruptures expected during life of project	0.33	0.36 (+0.03)	0.37 (+0.04)	0.38 (+0.05)
Sensitive Receptors within 1/2 mile of Trunkline	11	0(-11)	0(-11)	0(-11)
1 mile of line	14	5(-9)	2(-12)	2(-12)
2 miles of line	24	14(-10)	5(-19)	5(-19)
WILDLIFE				
Elk winter range areas	154	220 (+66)	238 (+84)	244 (+90)
Deer critical winter range	175	241 (+66)	259 (+84)	265 (+90)
Pronghorn critical winter/yearlong	132	198 (+66)	216 (+84)	222 (+90)
AGRICULTURE/GRAZING				
Acres disturbed during construction	660	726 (+66)	744 (+84)	750 (+90)
number of livestock AUMs lost in construction	37	41 (+4)	41.5 (+4.5)	42 (+5)

[1]NOTE: Numbers shown in parens are the difference between that alternative and the preposed action.

CHAPTER 3

AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

The proposed action pipeline routes (as described in the Riley Ridge EIS) and the alternatives (as described in this document) begin and end at the same point, whth minor variations of several miles. Therefore, the description of the affected environment is the same as that discussed in the EIS.

Furthermore, there would be no change in impacts for the following resources, since the only differences among the alternatives are primarily a function of on-the-ground location: socioeconomics, water resources, air quality, visual resources, cultural resources, recreation resources, wilderness, timber resources, transportation networks, land use plans, controls and constraints, and noise. Nor would there be any difference in the Mandatory Items listed below:

Threatened or Endangered Species

Floodplains and Wetlands

Wilderness Values, Areas of Critical Environmental Concern, and Wild and Scenic Rivers.

Visual Resource Management

Prime or Unique Farmlands

Social and Economic Values

Cultural or Historical Resource Values

Water Quality

Air Quality

BLM Land Use Plan Conformance.

Impacts which do differ are discussed below.

WILDLIFE AND FISHERIES

Alternative 1

During construction, 66 more acres of elk winter range, critical deer winter range, and critical winter/yearlong pronghorn range would be disturbed for two seasons.

Alternative 2

During construction, 84 more acres of elk winter range, critical deer winter range, and critical winter/yearlong pronghorn range would be disturbed for two seasons.

Alternative 3

During construction, 90 more acres of elk winter range, critical deer winter range, and critical winter/yearlong pronghorn range would be disturbed for two seasons.

There would be no change in fisheries, since the same streams would be crossed in every case.

HEALTH & SAFETY

Alternative 1

Five (5) sensitive receptors would be located a little less than one mile from the pipeline and would require a variance. The town of Calpet is one of the five.

Fourteen receptors would be located within 2 miles of the line.

In addition, two (2) trailers would have to be purchased and/or moved. The line would be 60.5 miles in length. The number of expected ruptures, over the life of the project being 0.36.

Alternative 2

Two (2) receptors would be located a little less than a mile from the line which would require a variance.

Five (5) receptors would be located within 2 miles of the line.,

The line would be 62 miles long, with the number of expected ruptures over the life of the project being 0.37

Alternative 3

Two (2) receptors would be located a little less than a mile from the line, which would require a variance.

Five (5) receptors would be located within 2 miles of the line.

The line would be 62.5 miles long with the number of expected ruptures over the life of the project being 0.38.

SOILS AND VEGETATION

During construction, Alternative 1 would disturb 66 more acres than the proposed action; Alternative 2 would disturb 84 more acres; and Alternative 3 would disturb 90 more acres.

There would be no change in the number of sensitive rehabilitation acres disturbed.

AGRICULTURE/GRAZING

During construction, Alternative 1 would disturb 726 acres for two years, and 41 AUMS would be lost.

Alternative 2 would disturb 744 acres, with the loss of 41.5 AUMs.

Alternative 3 would disturb 750 acres, with the loss of 42 AUMS.

UNAVOIDABLE ADVERSE IMPACTS AND LONG-TERM ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

Since any variations in the supplemental alternatives would take place during the construction phase, no significant impacts or consequences would take place from those previously analyzed in the Riley Ridge EIS.